

**RECEIVED**

CENTRAL FAX CENTER

**MAR 19 2008**

Appln. No.: 10/630,905

Amendment dated March 19, 2008

Reply to Office Action of January 9, 2008

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Office Action of January 9, 2008, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. No claims have been amended. Claims 39-41 have been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-41 are pending in this application. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Applicant acknowledges and thanks the Office for the indication of allowable subject matter in claim 19. In view of the present remarks and amendments to the claims, Applicant has not rewritten claim 19 in independent form.

***Interview Summary***

Applicant thanks examiner Singh for the personal interview with Applicant and Applicant's undersigned representative on March 17, 2008. This section, along with the remainder of this paper, provides the requisite interview summary required by 37 C.F.R. § 1.133.

During the interview, Applicant and the examiner discussed the Teng reference, and its failure to teach or suggest, among other things, detecting a plurality of distinct user-selected text portions of the displayed contract text document, and executing a computer-based contract negotiation workflow process using the data structure as a template to drive the workflow process, as recited in claim 1. While the Interview Summary indicates agreement was not reached, the examiner did indicate that her cursory review of the Teng reference indicates that Teng appears to be missing the feature of creating an XML document from a contract text document, and that the examiner agreed to reconsider the features of claim 1 in light of Applicant's arguments during the interview. Applicants also agreed to present additional claims clarifying the XML features of the present invention, which have been added as new claims 39 and 40. No new matter has been added.

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****MAR 19 2008**

Appln. No.: 10/630,905

Amendment dated March 19, 2008

Reply to Office Action of January 9, 2008

***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 10-11, 13-14, 17, 20, 31, 34, 36, and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teng (U.S. Appl. Publ. No. 2002/0152254). Applicant traverses, based on the arguments presented above and during the personal interview. Based on the outcome of the interview, it is Applicant's understanding that the examiner will reconsider the rejection. Applicants have also added claims 39-40, which clarify the XML features of the invention, and also that the XML file, in some embodiments, IS the data structure that is used to drive the contract negotiation workflow process.

Independent claims 20, 27, 31, and 33 recite at least similar features or further recite that the user tags a contract document, and are therefore also believed allowable over Teng in their present form. Dependent claims 2-3, 5-6, 10-11, 13-14, 17, 34, 36, and 38 are allowable for at least similar reasons as their respective base claims, and Applicant respectfully requests the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 4, 7-9, 12, 15-16, 18, 21-30, 32-33, 35, and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teng in view of Dahlin (U.S. Appl. Publ. No. 2004/0122701). Applicant traverses based on the above arguments already presented, and further because Dahlin does not cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Teng.

Claims 27 and 33 and their respective dependent claims are allowable for similar reasons as with respect to claims 1, 20, and 31, discussed in detail above, because Dahlin fails to cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Teng.

**CONCLUSION**

All rejections having been addressed, Applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3153.

Respectfully submitted,

Page 10 of 11

Appln. No.: 10/630,905  
Amendment dated March 19, 2008  
Reply to Office Action of January 9, 2008

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Date: March 19, 2008

By: /Ross Dannenberg/  
Ross Dannenberg, Registration No. 49,024  
1100 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Tel: (202) 824-3000  
Fax: (202) 824-3001

RAD